

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the patent application in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Upon entry of this Amendment, Applicants will have cancelled original claims 1-31 without prejudice and added new claims 32-58. Applicants respectfully submit that no new searching is required due to the presence of the claimed subject matter in the originally filed claims.

Support for the new claims exists in the originally filed claims and, for example, in the following sections of the subject application: page 5, lines 10-24; and page 5, line 25 to page 8, line 2.

### **I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

*Groat et al.*

In the office action dated February 8, 2003 the Examiner rejected claims 1-10, 13-19, and 21-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner stated that the claimed invention was unpatentable over Groat et al. (US-2002/0111884 A1). Applicants contend that original claims 1-10, 13-19, and 21-31 were non-obvious over Groat, but have cancelled the subject claims in order to expedite prosecution.

There are three independent claims within the newly presented claims—claims 32, 45, and 52. The claims particularly point out Applicant's invention and contain a combination of elements neither suggested nor taught by Groat. Claim 32, for instance, recites a method for recording a configuration of a purchased data center component

automatically to a management system during a purchasing process. The method includes the following steps:

- 1) transmitting a purchase order for a component to a supplier, vendor or buying agent, wherein the purchase order is generated from an asset template;
- 2) receiving a container including the purchased component, wherein a machine-readable code has been placed on the outside of the container;
- 3) scanning the machine-readable code, wherein the code contains information on the configuration of the purchased component;
- 4) sending the scanned information regarding the purchased component to an order processing center and a data center management system; and,
- 5) correlating the purchased component with a purchase order for the component.

Groat, which discusses a system for managing information related to a supply chain, does not disclose a method <sup>not claimed</sup> of automatically recording a configuration of a purchased data center component. This is made crystal clear through Groat's "exemplary situation in which a compression pump is sold by a supplier to a manufacturer of a refrigerator." [Paragraph 0034] Furthermore, given a discussion of such examples, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Groat to arrive at Applicants' invention. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Groat.

///

///

///

*Groat et al. in View of DeWolf et al.*

In the office action dated February 8, 2003 the Examiner rejected claims and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The Examiner stated that the claimed invention was unpatentable over Groat et al. in view of DeWolf et al. (US-20002/0032626 A1). Applicants contend that the newly presented claims discussed above are non-obvious over over Groat in view of DeWolf for at least the reasons discussed above.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections is requested. Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 7/8/03

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey A. McKinney

Reg. No. 43,795

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP  
PO Box 51860  
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728  
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.103  
Fax: (650) 752-0995